



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

if we have been able to push our pupils through the first six books of the *Aeneid* in the fourth year with our defective methods, surely we ought to be able to do at least as much on the reformed system.

In this connection, it might be well to reiterate that our Commission was not a Commission of the American Philological Association. That body only devised a plan for the formation of the Commission at the request of the various Classical Associations. And likewise as a matter of courtesy and appreciation, the Commission presented the report to the American Philological Association before publishing it.

G. L.

AMATEUR AND PROFESSIONAL LATIN IN THE HIGH SCHOOL¹

In the course of the present wide-spread and rapidly increasing demand for revision of our educational system the question has often arisen whether Latin is of any real value in secondary education, or is merely a survival of the unfittest, as sometimes occurs where man has interfered with the operation of Nature's laws. An educational administrator of no slight importance has made the statement that "There is no doubt that the average American high school boy gets less out of Latin than out of any other subject in the curriculum". If this be true—and too many people are already announcing it as a fact—it would seem to be high time for the Latin teachers of the country to take cognizance of it. The question is neither new nor especially attractive to Latin teachers, but conditions are rapidly approaching a point where such criticisms must be met and some changes made as a matter of self defense.

Before undertaking the defense of our present position it might be well to consider why we are in this position and whether it is as strong as we can make it. We are working with a high school curriculum which is a copy, on a smaller scale, of the academic college curriculum, which, in turn, is a direct descendant of the classical schools of the middle ages. Despite the fact that the purpose and nature of the modern high school are radically different from those of the mediaeval college, the curriculum has changed but little. In Latin and Greek even the textbooks and methods of teaching have remained substantially the same. Attempts to adapt the curriculum to the conditions and theories of modern education are ridiculed as 'fads and frills' and the notorious conservatism of the pedagogue prevails in spite of constant complaint and opposition. As a result the present high school curriculum is about as adequate for the purposes of modern public education as mediaeval weapons and armor would be for modern warfare.

The existence in the high school of the present

narrow methods of Latin teaching is due primarily to the fact that in the mediaeval college which the high school represents Latin was logically and actually a technical subject. It is still a technical subject in most college work, and for that reason the college professor generally does all in his power to make Latin a technical subject in the high school. Consequently our high schools, as Dr. Wilson has said, are attempting the impossible by trying to give each pupil both a liberal and a technical education. Latin teachers are among the worst offenders in this respect, since they preach one idea and practice another. From the broad pedagogical standpoint, Latin in the high school belongs to the liberal branches of education, but we find it presented by most teachers as a technical subject, taught almost entirely for its intrinsic value. This method is radically wrong and is the weakest point in our position. It cannot be successfully defended and unless abandoned may bring Latin to the same subordinate position to which Greek has been driven.

In order to retain the position of Latin in the curriculum we should recognize the fact that Latin should be presented in public schools as a means and not as an end. This is the essential difference between high school and college Latin, and the methods of presentation should vary accordingly. With cultural or disciplinary studies the important thing is not the facts of the subject matter, but the mental training acquired in assimilating and handling those facts, and for this reason the method of presentation is of prime importance. The college professor has the comparatively easy and relatively unimportant task of teaching a few select pupils to read and write Latin. The high school teacher, on the other hand, is supposed to use Latin as a means of developing in the many thoroughness of observation, accuracy of deduction, and fluency of expression, an accomplishment far more difficult and infinitely more valuable than the mere knowledge of Latin. The college professor and his classes are ipso facto professionals, aiming usually at the highest possible technical knowledge of the subject, while the high school pupils are amateurs, taking the work for the sake of the liberal training which it is supposed to furnish. In athletics there is a well-established belief that professionalism among amateurs inevitably ruins the work by changing the point of view and raising the standard to a point which is discouraging or impossible for the average amateur. Practically the same thing occurs when the college professor is allowed to set the pace for high school Latin. The necessity of teaching technical points for examinations makes a liberal presentation of the subject impossible, while the college entrance standard imposed upon all indiscriminately produces a pressure which makes the work a discouraging task for both class and teacher. Under such con-

¹ This paper was read at the meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Haverford, Pa., April 23, 1907.

ditions the lesson usually degenerates into mere parrotlike recitation of vocabulary, paradigms, and translation—the purely technical features of Latin study. A pupil may attain a very high rating in these points, having learned dozens of rules, yards of vocabulary, and countless pages of paradigms and translation and still be among the many who, as Dr. Jordan says, get less out of Latin than out of any other subject in the curriculum.

In order to make Latin of genuine and fundamental value in secondary education, it must be so presented that the emphasis is not upon the facts of the Latin language, but on the mental exercise and habits developed in handling those facts. The work should be of a kind that requires less memorizing and more thinking, less extensive home-work and more intensive classroom work, less Latin and more linguistics. The necessity and value of general linguistic training in the high school and the advantages of Latin as a basis of such work are generally admitted. In view of this fact it would seem that our position could be made impregnable by using Latin as the vehicle rather than as the destination of our linguistic study. Unless teachers adopt that attitude Latin will probably be relegated to a subordinate position in the regular high school curriculum.

To break up the conventional method of teaching Latin as a technical subject, valuable as an end in itself, and to develop the subject along liberal and cultural lines, would require the elimination of many of the eccentricities of Latin as she was written, and the addition of vocabulary and exercises especially adapted for mental discipline rather than the translation of the Classics. It is not probable that Latin can retain its present status in secondary education unless the classical fetish is renounced. No one would think of denying that those who study Latin as a technical subject should read the classical Latin as they find it, but there is no reason why the same rule should apply to the study of Latin as an element of a liberal education. For high school purposes the Latin read should have a vocabulary closely related to English, a style with no unnecessary complications, and a subject matter worth remembering. None of the texts commonly read comes near meeting these requirements, and there is no practical reason why a text could not be written today far better suited to needs of high school pupils than the classical authors are. A short Greek and Roman history, an elementary comparative grammar, and a collection of myths and fables would make an excellent course of reading for high school purposes, and would probably be far more palatable and digestible than the matter now read. With such texts the forms, vocabulary, syntax and prose could be developed uniformly and in a much more systematic way than is now possible.

The vocabulary for such texts should be restricted, as far as possible, to words related to English, and should contain a large number of the post-classical words from which the Latin in English is so largely derived. Word analysis and the study of derivatives should be an essential feature of the work from the very first day, and pupils should understand at the outset that Latin is a very near relative of English and more like English than English itself. It is surprising what a lively interest beginners take in derivatives and word formation, and the English dictionary will enable them to do considerable independent investigating.

Simple words, prefixes, and suffixes should form the basis of the work, and compounds should be learned as such primarily. A pupil who knows *conduco* and *infero* should be allowed an opportunity to try to figure out *induco* and *confero*, although our textbooks make no provision in their vocabularies for any such independent work.

If the drill on declension is to be used for the purpose of mental training, it should consist of rapid extempore translation of phrases illustrating the cases rather than memoriter recitation of paradigms. Every pupil is able to learn the paradigms perfectly and will do so if the teacher will accept nothing else as satisfactory, but it should be understood that the paradigm itself is simply a starting point in learning the cases.

In the treatment of the verb there is need of a very radical revision of the traditional methods. It should be developed synthetically as a logical and regular compound of stem, tense-sign, and personal ending, corresponding exactly to the principal parts, auxiliary verb, and personal pronouns of the verb in English. With such a systematic treatment of the verb pupils in the first term of Latin can soon learn to develop the verb independently from the principal parts and endings. The amount of memorizing is reduced to a minimum, being replaced by processes of synthesis and analysis which are certainly much more valuable pedagogically than the usual parrot-like memorizing and recitation of page after page of paradigms. Three-fourths of the paradigms in the majority of our textbooks are useless repetition and prevent the pupil from constructive work of a kind that is both interesting and profitable.

When a boy has learned the imperfect of *sum*, why should the textbook give in full the inflection of 50 or 60 other words with exactly the same personal endings? After the future of *sum* is given, why insult the common sense or blunt the intelligence of the pupil by printing the full inflection of *amabo*, *rego*, and 49 other paradigms with identical endings? Apparently the editors are devoted to the amiable policy of rendering the work attractive by making it as easy as possible. There is a widespread suspicion, however, that the endeavor to render school

work attractive by making it easy has in most cases so emasculated the work as to make it a mere travesty on education. There is much reason to believe that the Spartan severity of the oldtime pedagogue was much better discipline for the average boy than the mollicoddling methods which have replaced it. While the oldtime schools did not encourage precocity or encyclopedic breadth, they certainly did produce men with strong, well balanced will-power, and the ability to do a few things well and thoroughly, a type said to be too scarce among graduates of the present generation.

Thoroughness in Latin depends very largely upon how far and well the syntactical side of the work is developed.

Syntax, in so far as it concerns the structure of the sentence, deserves far greater prominence than is generally given to it in elementary classes. It is especially valuable for two reasons; first, because it compels the pupil to make a careful analysis of the sentence in both languages, and, second, because it discourages mere memorizing and cribbing. There is nothing more demoralizing to weak pupils than a method of teaching which permits a pupil to get credit for work not his own. In most cases the teacher who allows such parasitic work is doing more harm than good.

Another almost universal fault in elementary classes is the use in recitations of a book with vocabulary, notes, and often paradigms on the same page as the sentences which the pupil is translating in class. The convenience of referring to this information during the recitation leads to a form of cheating and 'near-knowledge' which often misleads the pupil as well as the teacher. Practical experience and comparison have shown that pupils accustomed from the first to reciting without the aid of the book get far better results than those who had the aid of the book in recitation. If the majority of our pupils really learned what they are supposed to learn in the first year's work nine-tenths of the difficulties in the higher classes would disappear and the proposed reduction of required reading would be entirely unnecessary. What we need most in elementary Latin is the elimination of useless technicalities from the first year's work to an extent which will allow thoroughness and intensive work with an abundance of drill and supplementary exercises at sight. Strange to relate, the very persons who are responsible for the overloading of the high school Latin curriculum are the ones who complain most bitterly of the lack of thoroughness in the elementary Latin.

Lack of thoroughness, however, and over-promotion are prominent characteristics of our New York City school system, from first to last, and there seems to be little probability of any improvement, unless the budget makers and their allies can be

convinced that the school problem is of greater importance than the transportation problem, an admission which is not to be expected from New York City politicians.

It seems probable, however, that high-school Latin as a whole could be made more profitable and popular if the teachers could be induced to pay more attention to systematic methods of presentation and less to grammatical technicalities, to emphasize construction, development, and correlation rather than facts, to cover less ground and do it more thoroughly, persistently to discourage dishonest and parasitic work, and to make frequent use of that remorseless drill which compels the pupil 'to get to the point and get there quick'. Although such work might not be popular with the pupils, it would probably appeal strongly to their parents, who are the parties we must satisfy, if our work is to be acceptable. It is foolish to try to make Latin scholars of all our high-school pupils, but if Latin can be made an effective agent for developing the powers of observation, deduction, and expression, it will certainly not be the most useless subject in the curriculum.

C. R. JEFFORDS.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, Brooklyn, N. Y.

REVIEWS

Essays on Greek Literature. By Robert Telverton Tyrrell. London: The Macmillan Co. (1909). Crown 8 vo. Pp. xi + 202.

The Messrs. Macmillan have done a distinct service to the cause of classical letters in republishing, in a single neat volume, these five essays by the former Professor of Greek in the University of Dublin. We have too few essays of such sanity, critical acumen, and literary insight, on classical subjects; and those that exist are mostly tucked away in old issues of periodicals not generally accessible. Yet one cannot lay down this volume without wishing that as Dr. Tyrrell and the publishers have done so much they had done something more. It is true that criticism is partly disarmed when the author says in his Preface: "I had thought of endeavoring to bring the studies more 'up-to-date'; but in some cases there seemed little to add, and in others such an attempt would have run counter to the original design". But it is due to those of the classically trained public who still take more than a languid 'literary' interest in Greek and Latin authors to be informed what a scholar of Dr. Tyrrell's eminence thinks nowadays of the questions here discussed, not merely what he thought about them twenty or ten years ago; the Preface is not adequate in this respect.

The essays deal with Pindar, Sophocles, The Recently Discovered Papyri, Bacchylides, and Plutarch.

The first is a temperate but very sympathetic appreciation of a poet singularly difficult for modern readers to enjoy without reservation. Dr. Tyrrell